

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9 have been amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the feature. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 9 have been amended. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,620 (Thatte) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023180 (Klimczak).

In item 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged as follows: the policy object 180 of Klimczak is part of a message; therefore, an object ID is part of a message.

Applicants respectfully submit that one of the advantages of the present invention is that it is not necessary to specify an object of a partner, that is, it is not necessary to include an object ID and the like of a partner in a message.

Further, in response to Applicants' previous arguments that "Klimczak neither discloses nor suggests 'a message including a message type and a message body,'" the Examiner alleged that an object including an object type and an object description in FIGS. 5-9 of Klimczak corresponds to a message. See item 13 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's allegation is incorrect.

Applicants further submit that the present invention is also different from Klimczak for other reasons. For example, in the object collaboration apparatus according to at least one embodiment of the present invention, as illustrated in FIG. 1 and the description thereof, the object A does not need to have knowledge previously regarding the processing ability of the object B as well as the presence of object B. The object A only needs to form the state thereof and the desired processing contents in a message and send it. The object B monitors a message flowing on the network, matches the monitored message with the message/action reaction relationship storing part. When the object B determines that an action corresponding to the message can be executed, the object B executes the action. Thus, the objects A and B do not need to recognize the presence and processing ability of the respective partners previously, and the mild collaboration between objects can be realized.

In contrast to the present invention, according to the device of Klimczak, an object needs to recognize the processing ability (and the like) of another object previously.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 6, 7, and 9 are patentable over the references, as Klimczak does not cure the deficiencies of Thatte. As dependent claims 2-3 and 5 depend from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-27-07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501